

schools cannot take the place of a strong and loving family.

Parents are quite clear about the values they want taught: honesty, respect for others, solving problems without violence and a heavy emphasis on equality, fairness and getting along with other students. They like the idea that all of us should live together harmoniously and believe schools have to teach values which unite us as a nation, rather than divide us on racial and ethnic lines.

Most seem to favor teaching specific moral values in the classroom, but when it comes to a broad concept of character education Hoosiers seem divided, many of them supporting it but many of them saying it should be left to the parents and the churches.

Federalism issues: Hoosiers favor the long-standing approach of having state and local governments take primary responsibility for elementary and high school education. They believe that decisions on school curricula, administration and organization should be made at the state and local levels, not in Washington. They reject the federal government mandating education goals and standards.

Hoosiers strongly favor federal support for higher education, particularly in providing grants, loans and other federal assistance to students from moderate income families. Many parents tell me of the importance of sending their children to college, but express concerns about the rising costs of a college education. For many families, federal education assistance makes a difference in whether and where a child can go to college.

Conclusion: A strong education system in Indiana and around the country is important for many reasons. It helps boost the productivity of our economy, which means higher living standards for workers and their families. It also means Americans better able to participate in the workings of democracy, and, most importantly, an improvement in the quality of individual lives. One of the best investments our country can make is in education.

I share the priority Hoosier parents give to education. I agree that state and local governments must take the lead on education issues. The federal government can, where appropriate, lend a helping hand, but should focus its main efforts on providing a strong and healthy economy which can free up resources at the state and local level for education programs.

I do not believe Congress should meddle in the educational affairs of the nation's schools. It should not write guidelines for instruction, textbooks or tests, or teacher preparation, or other matters. Congress must be extremely careful that in pushing for national standards it exercise restraint, and not try to direct what is taught, how it is taught, and how it is tested. Schools work best when they are managed by people closest to them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1995, during consideration of H.R. 1854, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996, I am on record as having voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 402, offered by Representative MICHAEL CASTLE. This amendment addressed funds for Members' official mail expenses, reducing them by \$4.6 million. The

Castle amendment was offered as a substitute to Representative MARK NEUMANN's amendment, which would have reduced Members' representational allowances by \$9.3 million.

I felt Representative NEUMANN's amendment was a more fiscally responsible proposal, as it offered a greater reduction in funding—and did not focus solely on Members' official mail expenses. I, therefore, voted against the Castle substitute, and intended to vote in favor of the Neumann amendment when it was brought up for a rollcall vote.

Unfortunately, a recorded vote was not allowed on Representative NEUMANN's amendment, due to a technical parliamentary procedure and the Chair failed the amendment by a voice vote. Therefore, I would like to state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that had a recorded vote been called for the Neumann amendment—reducing funds in the legislative appropriations bill for Members' representational allowances by \$9.3 million—I would have voted "aye."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to any effort to alter the longstanding ban on offshore oil drilling on the California coast.

As I am sure that you are well aware, the House Appropriations Committee voted on June 27, 1995, by a 33 to 20 margin, to continue a ban on oil and gas drilling operations on the Outer Continental Shelf. The vote reversed an earlier vote by the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee to remove the moratorium, which has been maintained for the last several years as part of the annual Interior Department appropriations bill.

I have been closely following this issue for many years. I have written to Chairman LIVINGSTON, Appropriations, Chairman REGULA, Subcommittee on the Interior, and to Chairman YOUNG, Resources, to maintain the ban. I have tried to encourage members of Appropriations, and whoever would listen to my pleas, to include the ban in their appropriations bill.

I believe that the Congress must operate in accordance with California's interests in this regard. Governor Wilson has made it clear that Californians are in favor of the moratorium. In fact, the State of California recently enacted a permanent ban on all new offshore oil development in State coastal waters. Californians agree that the environmental sensitivities along the entire California coastline make the region an inappropriate place to drill for oil using current technology. The 1989 National Academy of Sciences [NAS] study confirmed that one exploration and drilling on existing

leases and on undeveloped leases in the same area would be detrimental to the environment.

The findings of the NAS study encouraged me to introduce legislation on the opening day of this Congress to address the offshore oil drilling issue for California. My bill, H.R. 219, would prohibit the sale of new offshore leases in the southern, central, and northern California planning areas through the year 2005. In other words, H.R. 219 will ensure that there is no drilling or exploration along the California coast unless the most knowledgeable scientists inform us that it is absolutely safe to do so.

Unfortunately, the moratorium, as included in the Interior appropriations bill, is only extended through October 1996. Therefore, I am hopeful that my legislation will allow for the moratorium to be extended on a longer-term basis until environmental and economic concerns can be addressed.

For all these reasons, I commend the committee for including the moratorium and will oppose any effort that would allow for oil and gas drilling on our U.S. shoreline.

COMPREHENSIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS REFORM

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1995

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, as we begin debate on comprehensive telecommunications reform, this statement offers a unique perspective on one aspect of the industry.

GOVERNMENT CAN CONTINUE SERVICES WITH PAY-PER-CALL

(By Richard J. Gordon, Chairman, Teleservices Industry Association)

When Abraham Lincoln was President there were no telegraph machines in the White House. To receive reports from his generals on Civil War battlefields, the President had to walk to the building next door. That building housed the federal government's only telegraph equipment, equipment already commonplace to the railroads and a good many private businesses.

Until Herbert Hoover was President, the Oval Office did not have a telephone. By the time there was one on the President's desk, millions already were in heavy use by businesses and private citizens.

American businessmen have long been ahead of their governments in accepting, developing and using the latest technology.

Today, audiotext, already a four-billion-dollar business in the private sector, finally is getting attention in the public sector. Both state and federal government agencies, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, are taking advantage of pay-per-call.

At the Office of Planning and Building in Sacramento, California, citizens can telephone a 900 number, request information by punching in their fax numbers and receive copies of requested documents in about the time it will take the reader to finish this article.

Moreover, to provide information on over one million corporations, New York's Department of State operates a 900 number that costs a caller \$4.00 per call. This "teleservice" keeps seven people busy answering some 500 calls per day. What once cost the State \$250,000 yearly to answer telephone inquiries, now is a faster service whose users bear the costs.